LITIGATION ROSTER PROPERTY TAX

JUNE 2011

Property Tax JUNE 2011

NEW CASES

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court/Case Number</u>

SPRINT TELEPHONY PCS, L.P San Francisco Superior No. CGC-11-51139

CLOSED CASES

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court/Case Number</u>

CARLSEN, KURT San Bernardino Superior No. CIVV S906330

PROPERTY TAX

LITIGATION ROSTER JUNE 2011

ELK HILLS POWER, LLC v. California State Board of Equalization, et al.

San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2008-00097074-CU-MC-CTL Filed – 12/01/08

Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District Case No. D056943

California Supreme Court Case No. S194121

BOE's CounselPlaintiff's CounselTim NaderPeter W. MichaelsBOE AttorneyLaw Offices of Peter MichaelsKiren Chohan

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether BOE properly included the assumed costs of emissions reductions credits (ERCs) when valuing plaintiff's property under <u>Revenue and Taxation Code section 110</u>.

<u>Audit/Tax Period</u>: 2004-2008 <u>Amount</u>: Unspecified

Status: The trial court ordered summary judgment in favor of BOE. The Court of Appeal issued a published decision on May 10, 2011, affirming the trial court judgment and awarding BOE its costs on appeal. Elk Hills filed a Petition for Rehearing on May 25, 2011. On June 7, 2011, the Court denied Elk Hills' Petition for Rehearing. On June 20, 2011, Elk Hills Power filed a Petition for Review with the California Supreme Court.

METROMEDIA FIBER NETWORK SERVICES, INC. v. California State Board of Equalization, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2007-00882854-CU CO GOS Filed – 12/10/07

BOE's CounselPlaintiff's CounselJeffrey RichPeter W. MichaelsBOE AttorneyLaw Offices of Peter MichaelsVictoria Baker

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether BOE's valuation of Plaintiff's property was excessive (<u>California Constitution</u>, Art. XIII,

section 16; Revenue and Taxation Code section 5148).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004 Amount: Unspecified

Status: Case settled. Pending dismissal.

SPRINT TELEPHONY PCS, L.P. v. State Board of Equalization, et al.

San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-11-511398

Filed – 06/01/11

BOE's Counsel

David Lew

Richard N. Wiley

Law Offices of Richard Wiley

Kiren Chohan

<u>Issue(s)</u>: The issue in this case is whether plaintiff's 2008 Board-adopted unitary value of \$2,039,700,000 is overstated. (Cal. Const. art. XIII, § 19; Rev. & Tax Code section 5148.)

<u>Audit/Tax Period</u>: 2008 <u>Amount</u>: \$9,000,000.00

Status: Sprint PCS served the Board with a First Amended Verified Complaint dated June 23, 2011.

WESTERN STATES PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION v. California State Board of Equalization Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC403167 Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District No. B225932 Plaintiff's Counsel Cris K. O'Neall Cahill, Davis & O'Neall, LLP Kiren Chohan

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether BOE's Property Tax Rule 474 is valid (<u>Government Code section 11340</u> et seq.; <u>Revenue and Taxation Code section 51</u>; <u>Government Code section 15606</u>; Title 18 California Code of Regulations, sections 461 and 324; <u>California Constitution Article III</u>, <u>section 1</u>; and <u>Article XIIIA sections 1</u>, 2, and 3.)

Audit/Tax Period: None Amount: Unspecified

Status: On March 29, 2010, the court issued its Order on Submitted Matter denying BOE's Motion for Summary Judgment and granting summary judgment to WSPA. Judgment in favor of plaintiff was entered April 27, 2010. BOE's Notice of Appeal was filed on July 19, 2010. The case is currently being briefed in the Court of Appeal.

officied in the Court of Appear.

PROPERTY TAX

CLOSED CASES LITIGATION ROSTER **JUNE 2011**

CARLSEN, KURT v. San Bernardino County Assessor, et al.

In pro per

Filed - 09/22/09 San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVVS906330

BOE's Counsel Plaintiff's Counsel Stephen Lew Kurt Carlsen BOE Attorney Joan Huh

Issue(s): Whether BOE is a proper party to the proceeding involving a dispute over a reassessment of property by officials of San Bernardino County. (Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140.)

Audit/Tax Period: None Amount: Unspecified

<u>Disposition</u>: The court's Order Dismissing Action as to the State Board of Equalization was entered February 16, 2011.

DISCLAIMER

Every attempt has been made to ensure the information contained herein is valid and accurate at the time of publication. However, the tax laws are complex and subject to change. If there is a conflict between the law and the information found, decisions will be made based on the law.

Links to information on sites not maintained by the Board of Equalization are provided only as a public service. The Board is not responsible for the content and accuracy of the information on those sites.